

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/714,163	11/13/2003	Lawrence M. Kauvar	388512010411	2892
25225	7590 07/29/2005		EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE			VENCI, DAVID J	
SUITE 500	CENTRE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN DIEGO,	CA 92130-2332		1641	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/714,163	KAUVAR, LAWRENCE M.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
David J. Venci	1641		

Advisory Action	10/714,163 KAUVAR, LAWRENCE M.		CE M.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David J. Venci	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addr	ess			
THE REPLY FILED July 5, 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	THE REPLY FILED <u>July 5, 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). 	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		KST KEPLT WAS FILED	WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) a	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	` ','	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	·					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 7,8,11-13 and 20-22.	•					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	hed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
	SUPE	LONG V. LE RVISORY PATENT EX	AMINER			

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment raises new issues that require further consideration and/or search. Specifically, Applicant has amended claim 20 to recite the newly added limitation of "a celi".

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the prior Office Action has been considered but cannot be granted because Applicant's amendment dated December 20, 2004, added several claim limitations that were not previously considered. As Applicant correctly points out, claim 7 was amended to add the new limitation of "three cellular locations selected from the group consisting of..." which was not previously considered. With respect to claim 20, the steps of "contacting each member of said first set of signal transduction proteins..." and "contacting each member of said second set of signal transduction proteins..." were not previously considered. Applicant's amendments to claims 7 and 20 sufficiently distinguished Applicant's invention from the cited prior art, such that new grounds for rejection became necessary. Accordingly, the finality of the prior Office Action appears proper.